Remarks/Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of the remaining claims.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 12-16 and 21-30 remain.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bellas, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 3,258,019) (hereinafter "the Bellas reference'), in view of *Lyon* (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,739) (hereinafter "the Lyon reference").

The combination of the teachings of the Bellas reference and the Lyon reference fail to teach or suggest a self-contained mobile vehicle washing apparatus consisting of a filter fluidly connected to the tank to filter used water from the tank, thereby creating filtered water, and to supply the filtered water to the water supply.

Specifically, the Lyon reference does not disclose a self-contained mobile vehicle washing apparatus consisting of a filter fluidly connected to the tank to filter used water from the tank, thereby creating filtered water, and to supply the filtered water to the water supply. Instead, the Lyon reference only discloses a filter fluidly connected to a tank (the water reservoir), thereby creating filtered water, and supplies the filtered water for washing which then recycles the unfiltered water back to the tank (the water reservoir). If the Lyons reference were to teach or suggest the present invention disclosed in claim 12, the filtered water would travel from the tank (the water reservoir) to the water supply (water source), which it does not. The Lyons reference teaches away from transporting the filtered water to the water supply (water source) because the Lyons reference discloses a continuous process, and not a batch process. The Lyons reference cannot function properly in a batch process. In a continuous process, the filtered water may not return to the water supply (water source). In other words, the combination of the teachings of the Bellas reference and the Lyon reference does not teach or suggest claim 12.

Claims 2, 3, 6 and 13-15, which are dependent on Claim 12, and which include all the limitations of Claim 12, are allowable over the cited prior art, on the same grounds.

New claims 21-28, which are also dependent on Claim 12, and which include all the limitations of Claim 12, are allowable over the cited prior art, on the same grounds. Additionally, the elements claimed in these claims have not been described or shown in the cited references. Claim 21 finds support in paragraph 18 of the original specification. Claims 22-24 find support in paragraph 25 of the original specification. Claim 25 finds support in paragraph 27 of the original specification. Claim 26 finds support in paragraph 21 of the original specification. Claims 27 and 28 find support in paragraph 17 of the original specification.

New claims 29 and 30 are allowable over the cited prior art since the stated elements have not been disclosed.

No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims as they now stand are patentably distinct over the art cited during the prosecution thereof.

Applicant believes that the above amendments fully respond to Examiner's Office Action and further believes that all of the rejections have been overcome by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests that this application be passed to allowance.

Although there have been additions of new claims, Applicant believes that no additional filing fees are due. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees other than an Issue Fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 23-2426 of WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 214-745-5710.

Respectfully submitted,
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

By: _____
Ruben C. DeLeon
Reg. No.: 37,812

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

P. O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: 214.745.5400
Facsimile: 214.745.5390